

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL BULLETIN

GENERAL REVIEWS AND SUMMARIES

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF SEX

BY HELEN THOMPSON WOOLLEY

Cincinnati, Ohio

During the four years since my last review of the literature of the psychology of sex (PSYCHOL. BULL., October, 1910) the number of experimental investigations in the field has increased to such an extent that whereas it was difficult at that time to find anything to review, it is now impossible to review all I could find. The number of books and essays devoted to general discussions of the subject has also increased and their quality has improved very markedly. The emphasis placed on sex by the Freudian school and the interest in sex education, to say nothing of the whole feminist and woman's suffrage movement, have swelled the dimensions of the literature aside from experimental contributions to such an extent that no brief review could pretend to deal with it. Confronted by such a dilemma I have chosen the course of attempting a summary in the field of experimental psychology as complete as time and library facilities would allow, and a very brief mention of what seem to me the most important contributions to the other phases of the subject.¹

I. EXPERIMENTAL AND STATISTICAL STUDIES

There have been two extended series of tests applied for the purpose of measuring sex differences, one by Burt and Moore (19),

¹ I am indebted to Mr. Charles A. Reed, librarian of the University of Cincinnati, for special library privileges and for assistance in borrowing books and periodicals from libraries at a distance, without which it would have been impossible to prepare this review in Cincinnati.

in England, summarized by Jones (46), and one by Cohn and Dieffenbacher (22) in Germany. A third one by Pyle (69) in the United States, less comprehensive in scope, but representing a larger number of individuals, has sex as one basis of formulation. Other experimental papers either deal with only a few phases of the sex problem, or are formulated primarily from some other point of view. I will make the summary by topics, referring to the parts of the special investigations under the various headings.

(a) *Heredity*.—The present status of the theory of sex inheritance is very clearly and concisely summed up by Morgan (59). So far as a layman can see, there is little if anything in the theory which applies to the psychological problem. The ancient idea that the female is essentially an undeveloped male seems to be finally disproved by the fact that it requires more determiners—usually one more chromosome, or a larger sex chromosome—to produce a female than a male. When the additional sex chromosome was first discovered the assumption was that it determined maleness, doubtless because of the idea that the male was a more highly developed type. If there were any sense at all in such a formulation—which there probably is not—it would now have to be reversed. It seems certain that sex is determined at the moment of fertilization, and its determination is quite independent of environmental factors. Morgan believes that both the primary and the secondary characters of sex follow the laws of Mendelian inheritance, though not all biologists agree with him (Meijere, 55).

Secondary sexual characters are in some instances—chiefly in insects—determined independently of the sex glands. In the higher animals they are to a great extent dependent on the action of the sex glands, so much so that successful transplantation of the sex glands in the guinea pig carries with it a development of the secondary sexual characters of the opposite sex, even to the extent of producing secretion of milk in the milk glands of the male. The mechanism by which this is brought about is that of hormones given off to the body fluids by the sex glands.

The part played by sexual selection in evolution Morgan considers very small. There is little evidence that it takes place at all in animals. Even when consciously practised it is incapable of originating modifications of species, or producing steady change in any direction. It merely serves to develop in pure strain traits which have become mixed. Modifications of species always arise as mutations, for the appearance of which no explanation can at

present be offered. Mutations when they arise may be inherited as sex-linked traits of the type of color-blindness, which are found predominating in one sex, though in certain combinations they may be inherited by the other.

Both Morgan and Tandler and Gross (77), point out that it is impossible to find any single secondary character which belongs exclusively to either sex throughout the animal kingdom. For instance, superior size and brilliant plumage in some species belong to the female, while even the instinct for incubating eggs is assigned in some species to the male. Tandler and Gross interpret all secondary sexual characters as modifications of characters belonging to the species as such. They believe that the reason the sexes resemble one another after castration is merely that under those circumstances both sexes tend to revert to the original species type, an assumption which makes it unnecessary to assume the presence in each sex of the determiners of the other sex.

The theory of heredity, then, seems incapable of throwing light on the question as to what systems of the body carry sex-linked factors. Conceivably any of them, including the nervous system, might. It merely describes the machinery by means of which any mutation which arises may be inherited as a sex-linked trait.

(b) *Physical Development*.—Under this head I shall report a few papers which are of interest from a psychological point of view. Beik (9), instead of measuring children in absolute amounts, as most previous observers have done, measured a series of 6½-year old children in terms of the proportion to adult standards for each sex. On this basis, he found girls more advanced than boys in height, weight, dentition, brain weight, and probably in the development of the skeleton. Measured in absolute terms boys are ahead in most of these respects. Hertz, in the report of the Danish Anthropological Society (26) gives a series of measurements kept for the last 27 years which show that during that time girls have gained considerably in height and weight, while boys have been at a standstill. Burgerstein (17) in reporting European statistics, states that girls show a much greater susceptibility to disease than boys.

(c) *Motor Ability*.—Beik (9) found that at 6½ years, girls, measured in terms of proportion to adult attainment, were ahead of boys in motor control. In simple reaction time and in rate of tapping, boys and men—as in previous tests—have shown them-

selves superior (Burt and Moore 19). In card dealing, Burt and Moore found the boys quicker, while Calfee (20) found girls quicker. In card sorting and in alphabet sorting, girls were found decidedly superior by Calfee and by Burt and Moore. Culler (25) also found women faster on first trials of card sorting, though his group was small (17 of each sex) and he was not primarily interested in that point. In mirror drawing Calfee found the girls—college freshmen—faster than the boys throughout six successive trials. This agrees with previous work. Burt and Moore found the boys superior, but they do not consider their own test very reliable because of a change of method.

Mead (54) gives a small but reliable set of statistics supporting the popular opinion that girls learn to walk and talk earlier than boys. Starch (72) measured the handwriting of the entire school system of Madison, Wisconsin, and found the girls superior to the boys in speed, legibility, and form. The sex difference was greatest in form. Burt and Moore found the same difference with regard to speed. Cohn and Dieffenbacher (22) found that girls read faster than boys, a result also obtained by Burt and Moore in reading and in counting for speed.

Ballard (7) found a relation between left-handedness and stammering, both of which are more prevalent among males. He tries to show that while the greater frequency of left-handedness is characteristic of the male sex, the greater frequency of stammering among boys is an artificial condition brought about by attempting to force left-handed individuals to write with the right hand. Statistics show that stammering is far more frequent among the left-handed who have been forced to write with the right hand than among those who were allowed to write with the left hand. He offers no explanation of how the result is brought about.

The tentative generalizations which may be drawn from this series of facts are (1) that girls develop faster than boys from infancy; (2) that boys are superior to girls in rapidity of movement under conditions in which the direction of attention remains fixed, as in reaction time and tapping; and (3) that girls are superior to boys in rapidity of motion in types of activity in which the direction of attention is constantly shifting—activities which involve rapid adaptations—such as card sorting, mirror drawing, reading and writing.

(d) *Sensation and Perception.*—(1) *Skin and Muscle Sense.* Bobertag (11) found that boys of 8, 9, and 10 years are more accu-

rate in the Binet-Simon test for discrimination of weights than girls. Burt and Moore (19) confirm this result for both children and adults. They also found the space threshold of females, child and adult, very much finer than that of males. These sex differences are in accord with previous investigations. (2) *Hearing*. Hentschel (38), who tested 250 children of each sex in Germany, found that boys discriminate pitch better than girls both when a musical interval is employed, and when much smaller differences of vibration rate are made the basis of comparison. The boys are from 2 to 7 per cent. ahead in the several series. Burt and Moore, like previous investigators, found females a little better in pitch discrimination than males. (3) *Vision*. Burt and Moore found females superior in fineness of color discrimination. Monroe (58) in giving the Binet-Simon tests to 300 boys and 300 girls, of from three to six years, found that the girls excel the boys in color perception and in color naming. Burt and Moore found the boys superior in judging visual space. These results also agree with previous work. (4) *Perception*. The group of tests which belong most distinctly under this head are tests of the cancellation type, which involve both perception and motor reaction. In these tests females of all ages are uniformly better than males (Haggerty and Kempf (36), Woodworth and Wells (86), Pyle (68, 69)).

The possible generalizations in this field are (1) females have a finer spatial threshold on the skin, better color vision, and more rapid motor responses to changing perceptions than males; and (2) males are superior to females in the discrimination of weights and visual areas. The results with regard to pitch discrimination are contradictory.

(e) *Memory*.—There have been two sorts of experiments which may be included under this head, the rote memory experiments and those in "Aussage" or report. Under the first head there have been tests by Aall (1) using objects, by Burt and Moore (19) material not stated, by Myers (64) using words and letters in testing incidental memory, by Vertes (79) using words, by Cohn and Dieffenbacher (22) using digits, by Pyle (69) using words, and by Winch (85) using consonants. All of these workers found females superior except Cohn and Dieffenbacher, and Pyle, who found no difference of sex. These results are in accord with most previous investigations.

The experiments in the psychology of report have been carried on chiefly in Germany, Holland and Norway, and are published in

German. The term *Bericht* refers to the spontaneous account given by the subject of the picture, story, or series of events presented to him, while *Verhör* refers to the results of an examination which he subsequently undergoes on the subject matter. These words I shall translate *report* and *examination*. The trustworthiness (*Treue*) is estimated by finding the proportion of correct statements to the total number of statements made, both correct and false. Spontaneity is measured by finding the proportion of correct statements in the report to the total number of correct statements in both report and examination. Some of the questions used in the examination are distinctly suggestive, which gives an opportunity to measure suggestibility. Finally it is possible to classify the kind of items reported by each sex, for qualitative differences of memory.

With regard to the extent of memory displayed by the sexes in these experiments, the results are somewhat contradictory. In view of the small number of individuals represented in many of the series (from 15, or even less of each sex, to 30) contradictions are not surprising. Aall reports two tests, one with adults (2) and one with school children (1). In both cases he followed the plan of asking for a second reproduction of the story without warning. In some groups a mental attitude of expecting an immediate reproduction had been induced, while in others the expectation was that the reproduction would be deferred. In all variations of the experiment he found the extent of immediate memory greater in the female. With adults the same difference held for the second reproduction, but the school boys were better in the second reproduction than the girls. Aall is inclined to lay great stress on the latter result. The same type of test was tried by Lem (49) with school children with exactly the reverse result. His boys displayed a greater extent of memory in the immediate reproduction than the girls, while in subsequent ones, asked for without warning, the girls caught up with and at last a bit surpassed the boys. Breukink (15) and Schramm (71) both compared groups of university students. Breukink used pictures and Schramm a story. Breukink found the extent of memory a bit greater in men, while Schramm found it greater in women. Cohn and Dieffenbacher (22), and Pyle (69), whose test of logical memory belongs here, both found school girls superior to boys at all ages. With regard to trustworthiness, Breukink, Schramm, and if I understand him correctly, Aall, found women superior, Lem found boys superior, and Cohn and Dieffenbacher found no difference of sex. The latter authors report that girls have a decidedly greater degree of spontaneity.

Aall lays great stress on the qualitative differences in the reports as distinctive of sex. These analyses have been carried to too great length to be reported here. The chief point of agreement among them is that females report visual elements and particularly colors more frequently than men. Several of them also find that males report space relations more accurately than females, a fact corroborated by Myers (64) in his study of incidental memory.

Memory of dreams can be considered a special case of the psychology of report. In an Italian kindergarten in which the children take a nap every day, they were questioned immediately on waking with regard to what they had dreamed. Doglia and Banchieri (27) made records for 100 children at three years of age. The girls remembered more dreams and remembered them more fully than the boys. Two years later Banchieri (8) reexamined a large portion of the same group, and found that the same sex difference persisted.

To sum up then, females are superior to males in memory at all ages. The difference is clear and very uniform with regard to rote memory. In experiments in report sometimes one sex and sometimes the other has shown itself quantitatively superior, but on the whole the advantage is with the females.

(f) *The Effect of Drill.*—Closely allied to memory are the investigations on the effect of drill. Brown (16) and F. M. Phillips (67) both tested elementary school children with respect to the efficacy of drill work in arithmetic. Brown found no difference in this respect between the sexes, while Phillips found that the boys gained more than the girls. Wells has two papers which touch on the subject, but in both instances the sex groups are too small to be significant. In one (83) he found a progressive improvement of endurance with practice which was greater in women than in men. In the other (82) he found no difference in the gains made by practising addition and number checking. Yoakum and Calfee (88) report that their freshmen boys gained more in practising mirror drawing than the girls, though they did not catch up with them. Culler (25) observed that the men of his comparable group (only 7 of each sex) gained with practice in card sorting enough faster than the women to surpass them, particularly after an interference due to a rearrangement of the system of sorting. These investigations have been very different in type, and most of them represent small groups, so that generalizations are not safe, but there have been more of them which report a faster rate of improve-

ment with drill in boys than in girls. It is interesting to notice that these tests have been carried out with processes in which females are at the start faster.

(g) *Association*.—Huber (45) carried out, with soldiers in training, the same series of free associations that Reinhold had previously tried with the girls of an advanced school. Though he states that differences of sex exist, the specific differences which he finds, such as greater uniformity in the associations of the girls, and more predicate, adjective and definition reactions on the part of the soldiers, he explains as due not to sex, but to the amount of education in the two groups. Free association tests consisting in recording the number of words which could be written in a given length of time are reported by Burt and Moore (19) as showing boys faster, and by Pyle (69) and Lobsien (51) as showing girls faster. The latter found the difference marked from 9 to 11 years, but insignificant in older children. Since girls write faster than boys, such a test cannot throw much light on the rapidity of the thought process. Free associations in which the reaction time for each word has been measured, have been very uniformly found faster in men than in women. Haggerty and Kempf (36) and Wells (81) confirmed this result. Controlled association of the type represented by fundamentals in arithmetic (addition, etc.) is usually faster in females. Burt and Moore found boys faster, but Courtis (24) with his enormous series of New York school children, Phillips with a smaller number of school children, and Haggerty and Kempf with university students found girls and women faster. In controlled association of the opposite type girls are also apt to be superior (Burt and Moore, Pyle, Bonser, (15)), though in this case correctness of idea is a larger factor in estimating results than time of association. Haggerty and Kempf, considering speed alone, found men faster. The Ebbinghaus completion test has been used as a measure of sex difference by Cohn and Dieffenbacher (22), Burt and Moore, and Bonser. Burt and Moore, who call the test "completion of argument" because of the nature of the text used, found no sex difference, while the other two found boys superior. In a substitution test, Pyle found the girls faster at all ages, while in the number of associations suggested by an ink blot (called a test in imagination) boys were superior.

The generalization which is suggested by these results is that males are faster in free associations, while females are faster in practised systems of associations.

Both Wells and Haggerty and Kempf discuss the reasons for the more rapid free associations of men. Both papers take the view that the lengthened time of the women is due to a greater tendency to interference and suppression of ideas. This means, as Wells points out, that the associations of women are really controlled associations—controlled by the self for various reasons—to a greater extent than those of men. He thinks it possible that this result may be due merely to the fact that men have tested women, and that a woman testing men might obtain reverse results. Haggerty and Kempf are inclined to think that this tendency to be "on guard" against embarrassment is characteristic of the female sex. Apparently the Freudian school would find this interpretation in harmony with their theory of hysteria, which they explain exclusively on the basis of the suppression and substitution of sex impulses and ideas, and which is so much more prevalent among women.

With regard to types of reproduction within the associative process, Wells (81) and Lobsien (51) give results. The only decided difference of sex observed by Wells was the greater frequency of predicate associations in women, and of coordinate associations in men, a difference which had been previously noted. Among children Lobsien found the vast majority of associations belonging to the type in which no connection was evident. He calls them "springende" reproductions. The next largest class was the coordinates, while verbal and predicate associations were very few. The sex differences were small. Taking the entire group from 7 to 15 years, he found a few more "springende" associations for girls, and a few more of each of the other three types for boys. He also, then finds coordinate associations a bit more frequent for boys, though he fails to find predicate associations more frequent for girls. However differences of method make a comparison of results of doubtful value.

(h) *Attention*.—Cohn and Dieffenbacher (22) measured attention in terms of the distraction involved in simultaneous reading and writing, in which the girls suffered less from distraction than the boys. Burt and Moore (19) used two tests, one a test of the scope of attention called the spot pattern test, a tachistoscopic test in which a pattern composed of spots is reproduced, and one called irregular dotting which consists in tapping as rapidly as possible when each tap must hit one of an irregular series of dots. In both tests they found the boys superior, though in the second one the

girls were better if the time interval was short. Heymans (39) lays stress on the narrower range of consciousness of the female, which he thinks can be deduced from her greater emotionality, and which is corroborated by the greater prevalence of hysteria in women. These two tests of the scope of attention give contradictory results.

(i) *Judgment and Reasoning*.—Breukink (15) tested judgments of time and space in men and women, and found men more accurate with regard to time, but no sex difference with regard to space. In judging space from memory, Myers (64) found males more accurate. Cohn and Dieffenbacher (22) thought the boys showed better judgment in their series of tests in several respects. They judged better the additional time required to learn the long series of digits than did the girls, though they came out with no better result in the end. He found that the boys had more questioned judgments in their tests of report, and that they were more trustworthy than the girls on the most essential points of the picture, though not in the report as a whole. In the logical arrangement of themes of the two sexes they found no difference. Burt and Moore (19) found boys better than girls in solving mechanical puzzles, but observed no difference in the sexes in respect to reasoning power tested by a group of tests consisting of the completion of an argument, the completion of analogies, constructing sentences, opposites, and the correction of syllogisms. Bonser (14) who made a particularly careful and many-sided investigation of a large group of children in the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades, found the boys a little ahead in the median for the series, seven tests in all. In details there were more marked differences. The boys were ahead in reasoning out problems, in selecting correct reasons for statements, and a bit so in a completion test. The girls were ahead in opposites, in selecting correct definitions, and particularly in the interpretation of literature. With regard to age, he found the boys ahead up to twelve years, and the girls ahead above twelve years.

The other tests which I have been able to find deal with reasoning as displayed in the solution of problems in arithmetic. F. M. Phillips (67) using the Stone tests, and Courtis (24) using his own tests found the boys better than the girls in tests of correct reasoning. Fox and Thorndike (31) report that in their group of high school pupils, girls surpassed boys in arithmetical ability, but they believe that the girls in that community were a more selected set than the boys.

On the whole, then, males have stood better than females in tests of judgment and reasoning.

(j) *General Intelligence*.—Under this head there have been (1) several investigations of school marks in the United States and Europe, and statistics with regard to the number of advanced and retarded children in school systems, (2) Binet-Simon tests, (3) groups of selected tests, and (4) some single tests which can be more conveniently classified here than elsewhere.

(1) The instability of school marks as a measure of ability has been strikingly brought out by Starch and Elliot, who sent an examination paper to 180 head mathematics teachers to be marked, and received grades all the way from 25 to 90! However, taken in the mass they doubtless have some significance. Baldwin (5) studied school marks in the fourth and fifth grades of a city school. He found that the girls maintained a higher standard of scholarship than the boys. In accord with this was the fact that there were more repeaters among the boys and more girls who skipped grades. Miles (57) made a study of the marks in both elementary school and high school for a group of 106 children for whom he had continuous records. The girls were consistently ahead in every grade, and in every subject except arithmetic, where there was no sex difference. Klinkenberg (47) studied school marks in a school system in Holland which was partly coeducational and partly segregated. Boys were ahead in mathematics, physical sciences, history, and geography, subjects, he remarks, in which an analytic process of thought is uppermost. Girls were ahead in literary studies and languages. He states that girls do not stand examinations as well as boys, but do better in class work than one would expect from their examinations. Girls were further behind boys in geometry than in algebra, which is due, he says, to their well-known disinclination to constructive thought. Cohn (see Bobertag, 13), in the "Dritter deutscher Kongress für Jugendbildung und Jugendkunde" gave a report on school marks in a coeducational school in Baden. Taken as a whole, he found no sex difference, but in grouping the subjects he also found boys better in science and mathematics, and girls in the language group. Forsyth (30) reports that the mean college grade of women in the University of Illinois is a little higher than that of the men. Heymans (39) collected statistics on this point from the universities of Holland, and found that the women rank higher than the men. The fact is so well established in this country that it has given rise to the

witticism that university professors who used to object to admitting women to their classes on the ground that it would lower the standards of scholarship, now object because the women do so much better class work that the men become discouraged and refuse to compete in the game.

The number of advanced and retarded children in large school systems in the United States have been tabulated by Bevard (10) in Washington, D. C., by Hill (41) in New Orleans, by B. A. Phillips (66) in Philadelphia, and by Lurton (52) for fifty-five towns in Minnesota. In every instance there were more retarded boys than girls, and more accelerated girls than boys.

(2) The Binet-Simon tests have been made the basis of sex comparison in the United States by Goddard (35), A. C. Strong (75), and Monroe (58), and in Europe by Bobertag (11) and Wiersma (84). Monroe dealt only with children from three to six years of age. He tested 300 of each sex, and found no sex difference on the whole, though there were small differences in the various years. Goddard's results represent the largest number of children tested by the Binet-Simon scale under one director, 2,000 children. His table shows no clear difference of sex. Reduced to percents on the basis of the proportion of each sex who are two years or more retarded, or two years or more advanced—a procedure which he did not himself carry out—it appears that there is no sex difference in retardation (boys 18.4 per cent., girls 18.6 per cent.), but the girls have a slightly greater proportion of accelerated individuals (boys 3.7 per cent., girls 4.8 per cent.). Strong in tests of 225 white children found on the same basis a similar state of affairs, though the differences were larger—retarded, boys 9.6 per cent., girls 10.7 per cent.; accelerated, boys 3.2 per cent., girls 6.9 per cent. The European results rest on much smaller numbers. Wiersma, who tested 68 boys and 73 girls, found the girls ahead on the whole, while the boys had larger groups both of retarded and of accelerated individuals. Bobertag alone found boys superior to girls. His results are stated in terms of years and fractions of years for each sex at each age. The boys were superior at each age by amounts varying from 0.06 to 0.20 of a year. Bobertag is quite too scientific to regard this result as conclusive, since it rests on about fifteen of each sex at each age, but he remarks that if it is substantiated it would be in accord with other experimental findings. That it does not agree with the general trend of Binet-Simon tests so far is evident. It is quite possible, however, that results in the co-

educational school systems of Holland and the United States may prove to be different from those in the segregated schools of Germany.

(3) Cohn and Dieffenbacher (22), Burt and Moore (19), and Pyle (69) carried out series of tests on comparable groups of the two sexes. The subjects of Cohn and Dieffenbacher varied in age from 7 to 19 years. They were selected as representatives of the better and the poorer sections of their school classes. There were about 100 of them in all. Burt and Moore tested about 140 children of 12½ to 13½ years, and about 100 university students. These two series agree in finding no sex differences as a whole. Specific differences which they report have been mentioned under the appropriate headings. Pyle, testing school children in this country, found the girls superior, but his tests were not as varied in type as the other series.

(4) Two investigations, those of Libby and his coworkers (50) and that of Franken (32), were made by means of questions on general information. Franken, though he had a considerable number of subjects, had only small comparable sex groups. The younger girls were superior to the boys, but there were no differences among the older children. Libby and his associates tested grade children from the fourth to the eighth grade, and first year high school students. They report boys superior in all age groups. The girls were more cautious in their replies, and not so likely to guess if they did not know. Ash (4) tried giving school children the choice of two kinds of tasks, one of which required original observations, and the other compilations from books. He found no sex difference on the whole, but the boys were most numerous in the group who selected all their tasks from one type, while the girls were more likely to divide the choice. With regard to mental fatigue, which should, I suppose, be regarded as an element in general intelligence, Offner (65) reports that no sex difference has been observed.

On the whole, then girls have stood better than boys in measures of general intelligence. So far as I know, no one has drawn the conclusion that girls have greater native ability than boys. One is tempted to indulge in idle speculation as to whether this admirable restraint from hasty generalization would have been equally marked had the sex findings been reversed! The usual explanation of the result offered is that girls are more docile and industrious than boys. The greater industry of girls has been turned to account by Lipmann

in a novel argument for the inherent superiority of the boys. In his summary of the evidence on variability (see Bobertag, 13) he states that there are a larger number of series of measures in which the boys proved to be the more variable sex in the sense that there were more boys in the extreme quartiles of the range of values, and more girls in the two middle quartiles. He argues that the greater industry of the girls would be capable of raising them from the lowest quartile to a higher one, but would not suffice to overcome their lesser native ability to the extent of raising them from a lower to the highest quartile. To limit the effects of industry so much as to make it inoperative through a whole quarter of the range of a measure seems a bit extreme.

The writers who explain the results just quoted on the ground of the greater industry of girls are also those who emphasize their greater emotionality and rapid changes of mood. They seem to find no contradiction in the fact that the sex which is most dominated by emotions and moods is also the one which has the greatest capacity for plugging away at a task whether it is interesting or not. Another explanation quite as reasonable as that of the greater industry of girls might be sought in the fact that girls develop somewhat faster than boys. In the case of university students it may be, as Thorndike points out, that the sexes are selected on a different basis.

(k) *Affective Processes, Tastes and Ideals.*—The only direct experimental investigation of affective processes is that of Burt and Moore (19) in which they measured the psychogalvanic reflex in adults under stimulation of various sorts, and found the deflection in response to emotional disturbances greater in women than in men. It would be interesting to find out whether the same difference obtains when a woman instead of a man does the testing of the two groups. Under those conditions the plethysmograph and respirator—which to be sure are not very safe measures—gave opposite results in my own tests. Burt and Moore believe that an analysis of the content of association reactions revealed a difference of sex in emotionality at an early age, and that the difference increases with years.

Heymans (39) attacked the question of the relative emotionality of the sexes by the questionnaire method. A large number of intelligent people in Holland filled out the blanks, and a tabulation of results showed that a larger number of women than men were classed as emotional. Moreover the traits that were assigned

predominantly to women were also those assigned to emotional men. (For a discussion of the scientific value of this method see Thorndike, 78.)

There have been a few bits of experimental evidence bearing on other phases of affective life than degree of affectability. E. K. Strong (76) found that women have more and greater dislikes than men and are better able to classify them. H. L. Hollingworth (42) suggests the generalization, which he says needs further confirmation, that men resemble one another more clearly in their preferences, while women are more alike in their aversions. Kuper (48) confirmed for children Strong's statement that women have more dislikes than men. Her method was to ask 200 children, evenly divided as to sex and varying in age from 6½ to 16½ years, to arrange three series of pictures in the order of preference. All three series represented the same nine subjects. It is interesting to notice how nearly alike the order was for the two sexes. For girls it was religion, patriotism, children, pathos, animals, sentiment, landscape, heroism, and action. The only change in the order for boys was that the positions of children and of heroism and action together were reversed, bringing children last and heroism and action third and fourth in the boys' lists.

Ballard (6) classified preferences in the themes of free drawings made by London school children. The themes of boys in order of preference were ships, miscellaneous drawings, plant life, houses, human beings, vehicles, animals, weapons, and landscapes, while for girls the order was plant life, houses, miscellaneous drawings, human beings, animals, ships, vehicles, weapons, and landscapes. Here again the order is very similar. The chief difference is that boys show a much greater liking for ships and girls for plant life. Stockton (74) tried to measure preference by means of the choice of one of a pair of words. He found far more resemblance than difference. Both boys and girls choose time words a bit more frequently than space words, words for food rather than words for dress, and adjectives rather than verbs. For words of activity boys showed a small preference, while girls choose words of passivity a little more frequently. He found that preference based on the idea of the word increased with age, and more markedly so in the case of boys than in that of girls, but neither sex based the choice on meaning to as great an extent as upon mere position.

There have been three investigations which consisted in asking each of a large number of children to state what person, whether

acquaintance, historical character, or character of fiction he would most like to resemble. Brandall, reported by Gilbertson (34) worked with Swedish children, Hill (40) with American children, and Hoesch-Ernst (see Bobertag, 13) also with American children. They all agree that girls choose personal acquaintances oftener than boys, and that boys choose more public and historical characters. Brandall and Hill found that girls choose ideals from the opposite sex many times as often as boys. In the Swedish study boys choose characters from fiction more frequently than girls, while in this country the reverse was true. Brandall recorded also the reasons assigned by the children for their choices. He found that girls name moral, intellectual and artistic qualities more frequently than boys, while boys name material advantages, honor, and social position more frequently.

Anderson (3) gives the result of a questionnaire on the kind and amount of reading done by school children. She found no difference of sex with regard to amount, though girls read more books and boys more magazine articles. The girls used libraries more than boys. The preferences for kinds of literature were for boys, (1) stories of adventure, (2) detective stories, (3) and (4) war and love stories; for girls (1) love stories, (2) stories of adventure, (3) detective stories, and (4) travel and biography. Anderson also found that girls displayed a greater range in their reading, received more advice about it, and talked more about what they read than boys. The boys were more independent and original in choice.

Scheifler (70) has a paper on the tastes of boys and girls in games, based on a questionnaire given to 5,000 children. He divided plays into four classes, imitation plays (dolls, soldier, etc.), plays of bodily movement and contest (ball, tag, etc.), plays of intellectual activity and contest (building, checkers, chess, etc.), and occupation plays (sewing, reading, collecting, etc.). His general result is that girls give a greater preference to imitation plays, and boys to plays of bodily movement and contest, while there is no sex difference in the other two groups of plays. However when he picked out a set of plays which he designates as constructive—such as drawing, building and chess—the boys predominate. Scheifler is much relieved to note that coeducation shows no tendency to make the plays of boys and girls alike. If it did he thinks it would be a sufficient reason for doing away with coeducation. "Freuen wir uns vielmehr der schönen Eigenart der Geschlechter

und pflegen wir sie! Unser Volk braucht immer noch beides: Männer die da wägen und wagen, Frauen die im kleinsten Kreise unendlich Grosses wirken."

Melville (56) asked each member of the four high school classes to write down all the slang phrases he knew. He then selected 100 papers, evenly divided between the sexes, from each class. The boys were ahead of the girls in the number of expressions by amounts increasing from 18.7 per cent. to 40.0 per cent. in the four classes.

(1) *Creative Ability in Art and Letters.*—There have been several studies of children's drawings published. Cohn and Dieffenbacher (22) and Wagner (80) both followed the method of asking large groups of children to draw, under experimental conditions, illustrations for Hans Sach's poem "Schlaraffenland." They both classified the drawings as Kerscheneister had done, on the basis of representations of space, from the entire spacelessness of primitive drawings through linear and group arrangements to well-developed perspective. They agree that the primitive spacelessness is more characteristic of girls' drawings than of boys', and that girls take more pains than boys with decorative details. Cohn and Dieffenbacher found that girls treated a greater number of themes than boys, while Wagner found the reverse. Wagner noticed more elaboration of details in the drawings of the boys, and found them superior in inventiveness, in the representations of humor, and of motion. On the whole Wagner considers the boys very superior. The girls in his group excelled only in details which had to do with feminine interests. Cohn and Dieffenbacher noticed that the drawings of the boys were larger than those of the girls, and more characterized by heavy lines and strong colors, whereas the girls preferred delicate lines and soft colors. This difference in color preference had been previously noted in Kirkpatrick's monograph on "Studies in Development and Learning."

Muth (63) asked children from the first to the seventh years in school to decorate the outline of a plate and of a shield. She agrees with the two reports just quoted that girls prefer fine lines and a smaller more delicate type of drawing. She found that the sense of rhythm is earlier developed in girls and is stronger than in boys. The girls showed a better sense of proportion between the filled and the blank spaces of the surfaces. From the point of view of mere decorative effect, then, girls were superior, though she found the boys excelling in the expression of humor and in the originality of their drawings.

The generalization suggested by these pieces of work is that boys excel in perspective drawing and girls in decorative drawing.

Within the years with which I am dealing, I have found but one attempt to measure the relative merits of literary productions in the sexes. Cohn and Dieffenbacher (22) asked their group of children to write a theme on experiences at the local railroad station. They found the themes of the girls superior in most of the measures which they applied. Their themes were longer, both in words and in statements, their sentences were longer, they used more figures of speech, and a greater number of unusual expressions. Their themes were richer in content, and better in literary style. Analyzed for content they found that the boys mentioned more objects, more definite numbers and spaces than the girls. The girls' themes were richer in feeling, and more subjective. The sexes differed in the kind of feeling expressed. With girls sentimental and comic moods predominated, and with the boys the loyal and ethical sentiments. Though it does not belong in my period, it seems worth while to mention the fact that Giese (33) arrives at generalizations opposed to most of those just quoted! His monograph is an extended study of the free literary productions of boys and girls from the ages of five to twenty. The material he collected from all sorts of sources, chiefly from the public press. He criticizes Cohn and Dieffenbacher for passing judgment on a question of personal opinion like literary style, but does not seem to feel that his own work is open to the same criticism with reference to his selection of material, and his judgments of originality and value. He finds that boys write more poetry than girls, and do it much better, that their compositions are longer, more philosophic, and of higher artistic quality. The monograph contains very detailed comparisons of a large number of factors, and is half devoted to a collection of literary productions representative of the various ages.

(m) *Suggestibility*.—Two of the papers on the psychology of report (Aussage) contain measures of suggestibility. Breukink (15) in his group of adults found the women more suggestible than the men. They answered more of the suggestive questions both wrongly and correctly than the men did. Cohn and Dieffenbacher (22) in their group of school children found no sex difference in suggestibility, measured in the same way.

(n) *Variability*.—Several of the experimental series to which we have referred have been formulated in terms of variability, but most of the groups have been too small to be significant unless there

was wide agreement, which there has not been. The results dealing with the largest number of individuals, those of Goddard (35) on Binet-Simon tests and of Courtis (24) on tests in arithmetic fail to show any sex difference in variability. There have been two papers which sum up experimental evidence on the subject, one by L. S. Hollingworth (44) and one by Lipmann (see Bobertag, 13). Hollingworth sums up her review by saying, "If the evidence can be said to point in one direction rather than another, a greater female variability seems actually to be indicated in experiments so far made on the higher mental processes." Unfortunately I have not seen Lipmann's original paper, but only the abstract of it in the report of the congress at which it was delivered. He says that he worked over all the available statistics on variability in the sexes, and found that in 53 per cent. of the series of measures males were more variable, in 37 per cent. females were more variable, and in 10 per cent. there was no difference. Thorndike (78) selected a set of measures of various traits which he thinks most reliable as a basis for estimating variability, and concludes that they indicate somewhat greater variability of the male. He is convinced that greater variability of the male must be the explanation of the great preponderance of male geniuses. The amount of the sex difference in genius is most vividly brought out by comparing Cattell's former study of eminent men with that of Castle (21) on eminent women, and is of course not brought into question by sketches of the contributions to science made by women, such as those by Mozans (60), interesting as they may be.

Hollingworth questions the genuineness both of the greater number of male geniuses and of the greater number of male deficientes, facts which have usually been thought to be proofs of male variability. She points out (43) that most of the evidence for the greater number of male deficientes rests on statistics from institutions for the feeble-minded, which she and others consider unreliable because it is easier for feeble-minded women to maintain themselves outside of institutions than for feeble-minded men, since the former may earn their way either as household drudges or as prostitutes. As evidence of the truth of this assumption she reports a series of 1,000 consecutive cases passing through the New York clearing house for mental defectives, in which she found the females much more numerous than the males in the older group, showing that they had been able to maintain themselves longer in society than the corresponding males. The Binet-Simon tests confirmed this

by showing that of those individuals who tested at a given mental age, the women were older than the men. She concludes that if social pressure bore equally on the sexes, there would be as many females as males in institutions for the feeble-minded. The statistics from a social survey of the number of the feeble-minded outside of institutions, which gives more males than females, Hollingworth considers unreliable, though Thorndike apparently accepts them. With regard to genius (44) she makes the very pertinent suggestion that no one who has discussed the question has given sufficient weight to the fact that most women have devoted the greater portion of their time to occupations connected with bearing and rearing children, and in maintaining a home—occupations in which eminence is impossible though genius is not. No one can tell, she says, how much genius of a high order may have gone into these tasks where recognition in terms of fame is out of the question. She concludes that there is little ground for explaining the lesser scientific and artistic achievements of women on the ground of greater male variability. Finot (28, 29) makes much the same point in stating that in proportion to the number of women devoting themselves to scientific and artistic pursuits, the number of persons of eminence has compared favorably with males.

II. GENERAL DISCUSSIONS

The general discussions of the psychology of sex, whether by psychologists or by sociologists show such a wide diversity of points of view that one feels that the truest thing to be said at present is that scientific evidence plays very little part in producing convictions. As Coolidge puts it: "In our present stage, the conclusions as to the permanence or significance of any feminine peculiarity at which any observer will arrive are in accordance usually with his anti- or pro-feminine bias." Hartley expresses the same idea. Among psychologists Burt and Moore (19), Stern (73), Heymans (39), Wreschner (87), and Thorndike (78) have expressed opinions with regard to the facts of the psychology of sex, based on the experimental evidence. The generalization at which Burt and Moore arrive is that sex differences are most marked in the simpler functions of sensation and motion and decrease as one rises to the higher levels of mental activity, until in the most complicated functions no difference is to be observed. Stern arrives at exactly the opposite generalization! The simpler and more easily measured functions show no significant differ-

ence of sex, he says, while we may be certain that as we penetrate further with experimental methods into the more complex mental functions, the significant differences will appear. Heymans, basing his opinion largely on the returns from the questionnaires which he and Wiersma sent out, though he considers experimental results also, derives a differential psychology of sex from two fundamental factors, first the greater emotionality of women, and second their greater activity, in the sense of readiness to act. The differences in intellectual capacity he explains in terms of interest and attention, which are ultimately determined by emotionality. Heymans's book is exceedingly readable, but not altogether convincing. His principle fails to work at a very vital point. The fact that women are in many respects poorer observers than men, he explains on the ground that their emotionality limits their interests, so that they observe well only that which has emotional value for them. When it comes to accounting for the better rank of women in academic work, he finds that while men put effort chiefly on that which interests them, women are industrious and conscientious in all tasks, whether they find them interesting or not. This contradiction he attempts to resolve on the ground that women are more readily spurred to action than men. Wreschner's book is in the nature of a popular lecture summarizing experimental studies of sex. He gives no references, and no indication of the strength of the evidence underlying his generalizations. The source of his material is easily recognized by any one familiar with the field. As a matter of fact some of his statements rest on evidence so contradictory or so meagre that they are worth no more than a personal opinion. In his conclusions he agrees with Heymans in assigning to women a stronger emotional nature, and a smaller participation in abstract intellectual processes, but takes the opposite point of view with regard to activity, which he regards as distinctly greater in men. Thorndike (78) regards the differences between the sexes of the type revealed by experimental psychology as too small, in view of the large variations within each sex, to be considered significant except with regard to the greater variability of the male. So far as central tendencies in various abilities are concerned, he assumes no difference of sex. He is inclined to agree with the others that women are more emotional than men, and thinks it probable that the chief difference of sex aside from variability is to be found in the fighting instinct of the male and the nursing instinct of the female, instincts which affect lines of conduct.

One element in the success of men in scientific, artistic or social fields is their love of getting ahead of the other fellow, while women have less of a desire to win, and a more pronounced humanitarian tendency.

All of this group of men, in spite of their wide differences of opinion as to the nature of the psychological characteristics of sex, are convinced that they are inherent and are not to be explained by environmental influences during the life of the individual. Burt and Moore base their conviction on the fact that the sex differences which they found in English children and adults were similar in kind and amount to those of my series of American university students. Differences which remain constant at different ages and in different countries must, they think, be inherent in sex itself. They do not seem to have considered whether or not there are factors in the social environment of sex which remain constant in all modern civilized countries. Stern believes that sex differences have been found in processes which are not influenced by social environment, such as spontaneous drawings. Wreschner holds that some of the traits most characteristic of women, notably emotionality, are of a nature to be repressed rather than fostered by the social environment of women. Heymans points out with much justice that much of the argumentation with regard to what effect the social milieu would have on given traits is very inconclusive. It is no difficult matter to get up fairly plausible arguments to prove either that social conditions tend to foster emotionality in women (Finot) or that they tend to repress it (Wreschner). Heymans thinks it quite as reasonable to suppose that differences in traits determined the differences in environment as vice-versa. Finally Wreschner inquires somewhat peevishly how in the world we are to know what is inherited and what socially acquired, and calls upon all good citizens to help along the course of evolution, whose direction he is confident he perceives, by cherishing our present valuable distinctions of sex instead of subversively trying to overthrow them. However none of these men, except perhaps Stern, believes that the nature or amount of the psychological difference of sex is a sufficient ground for separate systems of education for the two.

There are a few points in the literature of experimental psychology which point to the importance of social influences. The sex difference in size, whose hereditary origin has seldom been questioned, is decreasing with the change in the educational regime of

girls. The Danish Anthropological Society (26) has found that within the last generation girls have made large gains in height and weight, while boys have not changed. It is interesting to notice, too, that in Germany, where the tradition of the mental inferiority of women is still strong, and the girls' schools are even yet inferior (Münsterberg, 62) experimental results are more likely than in other countries to show differences of sex, and to find them in the direction of male superiority. In the tests conducted by Cohn and Dieffenbacher in one of the few coeducational schools of high school rank in Germany, they found the girls superior not only to the segregated girls, but to the boys in the same school. They were a small group, and German psychologists explain their high rank on the ground that they were to a greater extent than the boys selected on a basis of ability. It is also significant that differences between the cultured and the uncultured in experimental results are usually far larger than those between the sexes (Breukink, 15).

When one turns to the books written more largely from the historical and sociological point of view, the trend of opinion is that mental differences of sex are of social origin. There are four scholarly and exceedingly interesting books of this type, Coolidge (23), Hartley (37), Finot (28, 29), and Müller-Lyer (61), coming respectively from the United States, England, France, and Germany. The last three all contain historical sketches of the position of women from primitive times to modern. Hartley and Finot also discuss the question of sex in animals, and its bearing on human problems. Coolidge's book is particularly interesting to American readers because it is written with immediate reference to the social position of women in the United States during the last few generations. They all lay stress on the view that social conditions account for most of the traits ordinarily considered feminine, and particularly for the limited accomplishment of women in art and science. Coolidge gives a vivid sketch of the way traditional domesticity limited and determined the intellectual life of women. The same point is effectively brought out from the German standpoint by Maurenbrecher (53).

REFERENCES

1. AALL, A. Ein neues Gedächtnisgesetz? *Zsch. f. Psychol.*, 1913, 66, 1-51.
2. AALL, A. Zur Psychologie der Wiedererzählung. *Zsch. f. angew. Psychol.*, 1913, 7, 185-210.
3. ANDERSON, R. E. A Preliminary Study of the Reading Tastes of High School Pupils. *Ped. Sem.*, 1912, 19, 438-460.

4. ASH, I. E. The Correlates and Conditions of Mental Inertia. *Ped. Sem.*, 1912, 19, 425-437.
5. BALDWIN, B. T. A Psycho-Educational Study of the Fourth and Fifth School Grades. *J. of Educ. Psychol.*, 1913, 4, 364-365.
6. BALLARD, P. B. What London Children Like to Draw. *J. of Exp. Ped.*, 1912, 1, 186-197.
7. BALLARD, P. B. Sinistrality and Speech. *J. of Exp. Ped.*, 1912, 1, 289-310.
8. BANCHIERI, F. I sogni dei bambini di cinque anni. *Riv. di psychol.*, 1912, 8, 325-330.
9. BEIK, A. K. Physiological Age and School Entrance. *Ped. Sem.*, 1913, 20, 277-321.
10. BEVARD, K. H. Progress of the Repeaters of the Class of 1912 of the Public Schools of Washington, D. C. *Psychol. Clinic*, 1913, 7, 68-83.
11. BOBERTAG, O. Ueber Intelligenzprüfungen (nach der Methode von Binet und Simon). *Zsch. f. angew. Psychol.*, 1911, 5, 105-203.
12. BOBERTAG, O. Ueber Intelligenzprüfungen (nach der Methode von Binet und Simon). *Zsch. f. angew. Psychol.*, 1912, 6, 495-538.
13. BOBERTAG, O. Dritter deutscher Kongress für Jugendbildung und Jugendkunde zu Breslau von 4 bis 6 Oktober, 1913. *Zsch. f. angew. Psychol.*, 1913, 8, 345-353.
14. BONSER, F. G. *The Reasoning Ability of Children of the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth School Grades*. New York: Teacher's College, 1910. Pp. 133.
15. BREUKINK, H. Ueber die Erziehbarkeit der Aussage. *Zsch. f. angew. Psychol.*, 1910, 3, 32-87.
16. BROWN, J. C. An Investigation of the Value of Drill Work in the Fundamental Operations of Arithmetic. *J. of Educ. Psychol.*, 1912, 3, 485-492, 562-570.
17. BURGERSTEIN, L. Coeducation and Hygiene with Special Reference to European Experience and Views. *Ped. Sem.*, 1910, 17, 1-15.
18. BURT, C. Experimental Tests of Higher Mental Processes and their Relation to General Intelligence. *J. of Exp. Ped.*, 1911, 1, 93-112.
19. BURT, C. and MOORE, R. C. The Mental Differences between the Sexes. *J. of Exp. Ped.*, 1912, 1, 273-284, 355-388.
20. CALFEE, M. College Freshmen and Four General Intelligence Tests. *J. of Educ. Psychol.*, 1913, 4, 223-231.
21. CASTLE, C. S. A Statistical Study of Eminent Women. *Arch. of Psychol.*, 1913, No. 27. Pp. vii + 90.
22. COHN, J. and DIEFFENBACHER, J. *Untersuchungen über Geschlechts-, Alters-, und Begabungs- Unterschiede bei Schülern*. Leipzig: Barth, 1911. Pp. vi + 213.
23. COOLIDGE, M. R. *Why Women are So*. New York: Holt, 1912. Pp. 371.
24. COURTIS, S. A. Report on the Courtis Tests in Arithmetic. *New York Committee on School Inquiry*, 1911, 1, 391-546.
25. CULVER, A. J. Interference and Adaptability. An Experimental Study of their Relation with Special Reference to Individual Differences. *Arch. of Psychol.*, 1912, No. 24. Pp. 80.
26. DANISH ANTHROPOLOGICAL SOCIETY. *Middelseer am Danmarks Antropologi*. Reviewed in *Ped. Sem.* 1913, 20, 544.
27. DOGLIA, S. and BANCHIERI, F. I sogni dei bambini di tre anni. L'inizio dell'attività onirica. *Cont. d. lab. psicol. d. univer. d. Roma*, 1910, 1, 9.
28. FINOT, J. *Préjugé et problème des sexes*. Paris: Alcan, 1912. Pp. 520.
29. FINOT, J. *Problems of the Sexes*. (Trans.) New York: Putnam, 1913. Pp. xiv + 408.

30. FORSYTH, C. H. Correlation between Ages and Grades. *J. of Educ. Psychol.*, 1912, 3, 164.
31. FOX, W. A. and THORNDIKE, E. L. Relations between the Different Abilities Involved in the Study of Arithmetic: Sex Differences in Arithmetical Ability. *Colum. Univ. Cont. to Phil., Psychol. and Educ.*, 1911, 2, 32-40.
32. FRANKEN, A. Aussageversuche nach der Methode der Entscheidungs- und Bestimmungsfrage bei Erwachsenen und Kindern. *Zsch. f. angew. Psychol.*, 1912, 6, 174-253.
33. GIESE, F. *Das freie literarische Schaffen bei Kindern und Jugendlichen*. Leipzig: Barth, 1914. Pp. xiv + 220; iv + 242.
34. GILBERTSON, A. N. A Swedish Study in Children's Ideals. *Ped. Sem.*, 1913, 20, 100-106.
35. GODDARD, H. H. Two Thousand Normal Children Measured by the Binet Measuring Scale of Intelligence. *Amer. J. of Psychol.*, 1911, 18, 232-259.
36. HAGGERTY, M. E. and KEMPF, E. J. Suppression and Substitution as a Factor in Sex Differences. *Amer. J. of Psychol.*, 1913, 24, 414-425.
37. HARTLEY, C. G. (Mrs. W. M. Gallichan). *The Truth about Women*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1913. Pp. xiv + 404.
38. HENTSCHEL, M. Zwei experimentelle Untersuchungen an Kindern aus dem Gebiete der Tonpsychologie. *Zsch. f. angew. Psychol.*, 1913, 7, 55-69; 211-222.
39. HEYMANS, G. *Die Psychologie der Frauen*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1910. Pp. viii + 308.
40. HILL, D. S. Comparative Study of Children's Ideals. *Ped. Sem.*, 1911, 18, 219-231.
41. HILL, D. S. *Exceptional Children in the Public Schools of New Orleans*. A Report of the Committee of the Public School Alliance. New Orleans: 1913. Pp. 36.
42. HOLLINGWORTH, H. L. Experimental Studies in Judgment. *Arch. of Psychol.*, 1913, No. 29. Pp. vi + 119.
43. HOLLINGWORTH, L. S. The Frequency of Amentia as Related to Sex. *Med. Record*, 1913.
44. HOLLINGWORTH, L. S. Variability as Related to Sex Differences in Achievement. *Amer. J. of Sociol.*, 1914, 19, 510-530.
45. HUBER, E. Associationsversuche an Soldaten. *Zsch. f. Psychol.*, 1911, 59, 241-272.
46. JONES, G. E. Mental Differences between the Sexes. *Ped. Sem.*, 1913, 20, 401-404.
47. KLINKENBERG, L. M. Ableitung von Geschlechtsunterschieden aus Zensurenstatistiken. *Zsch. f. angew. Psychol.*, 1913, 8, 228-266.
48. KUPER, G. Group Differences in the Interests of Children. *J. of Phil., Psychol., etc.*, 1912, 9, 376-379.
49. LEM, M. H. Kinderaufsätze und Zuverlässigkeit der Zeugenaussagen. *Zsch. f. angew. Psychol.*, 1911, 4, 347-363.
50. LIBBY, W., COWLES, H., etc. The Contents of Children's Minds. *Ped. Sem.*, 1910, 17, 242-272.
51. LOBSIEN, M. Ueber den Vorstellungstypus der Schulkinder. *Päd. Mäg.*, 457 H., 1911. Pp. iii + 67.
52. LURTON, F. E. Retardation in Fifty-five Western Towns. *J. of Educ. Psychol.*, 1912, 3, 326-330.
53. MAURENBRECHER, H. *Das Allzuweibliche. Ein Buch von neuer Erziehung und Lebensgestaltung*. München, 1912.

54. MEAD, C. D. The Age of Walking and Talking in Relation to General Intelligence. *Ped. Sem.*, 1913, 20, 460-484.
55. MEIJERE, J. C. H. Zur Vererbung des Geschlechtsmerkmale und secundärer Geschlechtsmerkmale. *Arch. f. Rassen und Gesell. Biol.*, 1913, 10, 1-36.
56. MELVILLE, A. H. An Investigation of the Function and Use of Slang. *Ped. Sem.*, 1912, 19, 93-100.
57. MILES, W. R. A Comparison of Elementary and High School Grades. *Ped. Sem.*, 1910, 17, 429-450.
58. MONROE, W. S. Intelligence of 600 Young Children. *Psychol. Rev.*, 10, 74-75.
59. MORGAN, T. H. *Heredity and Sex*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1913. Pp. 282.
60. MOZANS, H. J. *Woman in Science*. New York: Appleton, 1913. Pp. xiii + 452.
61. MÜLLER-LYER, F. *Phasen der Liebe. Eine Sociologie des Verhältnisses der Geschlechter*. München: Langen, 1913. Pp. xv + 254.
62. MÜNSTERBERG, H. The German Woman. *Atlantic Mo.*, 1912, 109, 457-467.
63. MUTH, G. Ueber Alters-, Geschlechts- und Individualunterschiede in der Zierkunst des Kindes. *Zsch. f. angew. Psychol.*, 1913, 8, 507-548.
64. MYERS, G. C. A Study in Incidental Memory. *Arch. of Psychol.*, 1913, No. 26. Pp. 108.
65. OFFNER, M. *Mental Fatigue*. Baltimore: Warwick and York, 1911. Pp. viii + 133.
66. PHILLIPS, B. A. Retardation in the Elementary Schools of Philadelphia. *Psychol. Clinic*, 1912, 6, 79-90, 107-121.
67. PHILLIPS, F. M. Value of Daily Drill in Arithmetic. *J. of Educ. Psychol.*, 1913, 4, 159-163.
68. PYLE, W. H. Standards of Mental Efficiency. *J. of Educ. Psychol.*, 1913, 4, 61-70.
69. PYLE, W. H. *The Examination of School Children; a Manual of Directions and Norms*. New York: Macmillan, 1913. Pp. 70.
70. SCHEIFLER, H. Zur Psychologie der Geschlechter: Spielinteressen des Schulalters. *Zsch. f. angew. Psychol.*, 1913, 8, 124-144.
71. SCHRAMM, F. Zur Aussagetreue der Geschlechter. *Zsch. f. angew. Psychol.*, 1911, 5, 355-357.
72. STARCH, D. The Measurement of Handwriting. *J. of Educ. Psychol.*, 1913, 4, 445-464.
73. STERN, W. Abstracts of Lectures on the Psychology of Testimony and on the Study of Individuality. *Amer. J. of Psychol.*, 1910, 21, 270-282.
74. STOCKTON, M. I. Some Preferences by Boys and Girls as Shown in their Choice of Words. *Psychol. Rev.*, 1911, 18, 347-373.
75. STRONG, A. C. Three Hundred Fifty White and Colored Children Measured by the Binet-Simon Measuring Scale of Intelligence. A Comparative Study. *Ped. Sem.*, 1913, 20, 485-515.
76. STRONG, E. K. The Relative Merits of Advertisements. *Arch. of Psychol.*, 1911, No. 17. Pp. 81.
77. TANDLER, J. and GROSS, S. *Die biologischen Grundlagen der secundären Geschlechtscharactere*. Berlin: Springer, 1913. Pp. iv + 169.
78. THORNDIKE, E. L. *Educational Psychology*. Vol. III. New York: Teacher's College, Columbia University, 1914.
79. VERTES, J. Das Wortgedächtnis im Schulkindesalter. *Zsch. f. Psychol.*, 1913, 63, 19-128.

80. WAGNER, P. A. Das freie Zeichnen von Volksschulkindern. *Zsch. f. angew. Psychol.*, 1913, 8, 1-70.
81. WELLS, F. L. Some Properties of the Free Association Time. *Psychol. Rev.*, 1911, 18, 1-23.
82. WELLS, F. L. The Relation of Practice to Individual Differences. *Amer. J. of Psychol.*, 1912, 23, 75-100.
83. WELLS, F. L. Practise and the Work-Curve. *Amer. J. of Psychol.*, 1913, 24, 35-51.
84. WIERSMA, E. D. Intelligenzprüfungen nach Binet und Simon, und ein Versuch zur Auffindung neuer Tests. *Zsch. f. angew. Psychol.*, 1913, 8, 267-275.
85. WINCH, W. H. A Motor Factor in Perception and Memory. *J. of Exp. Ped.*, 1912, 1, 261-273.
86. WOODWORTH, R. S. and WELLS, F. L. Association Tests. *Psychol. Monog.*, 1911, No. 57. Pp. 85.
87. WRESCHNER, A. *Vergleichende Psychologie der Geschlechter*. Zürich: Art. Inst. Orell. Füssli, 1912. Pp. 40.
88. YOAKUM, C. S. and CALFEE, M. An Analysis of the Mirror Drawing Experiment. *J. of Educ. Psychol.*, 1913, 4, 282-292.

THE HEREDITY OF MENTAL ABILITIES

BY H. C. McCOMAS

Princeton University

The recent work upon the heredity of mental traits is strongly influenced by the findings of the biologists, and especially the Mendelian formula. The newer point of view and the data collected by numerous field workers have given a new aim and character to this branch of research.

Several important investigations in the transmission of feeble-mindedness have appeared. Goddard's (9) work, *The Kallikak Family*, has received widespread attention. He traced two lines of descent from a soldier of the Revolutionary army. One line began with a feeble-minded girl whose illegitimate son was the forbear of 480 individuals, the other line with a normal woman, his legitimate wife, and numbers 496 persons in direct descent. In the former line 143 were feeble-minded, 46 normal, and the others unknown, or doubtful cases; in the latter line all were normal persons. In the defective line there were 41 matings, in which both parents were feeble-minded. They had 222 feeble-minded children and only 2 who were considered normal. Goddard believes his results "show the possibility that the Mendelian formula applies to human

heredity." Miss Danielson (4) traced the defective strains of a community, where feeble-mindedness was rife, back to two families; and her study of these two family-trees led her to believe that feeble-mindedness cannot be considered a "unit character," for two "recessives" did not yield 100 per cent. recessives, but only 77.3 per cent. Feeble-mindedness is rather due to the "absence of a set of traits." Easterbrook's (8) study of the defectives of an isolated community indicates that "heredity plays a part in indolence, alcoholism, licentiousness and shyness." Davenport has collected a number of genealogies, biographies and studies of the insane and criminal classes (5) which have many hints for the field worker, and his systematic arrangement of traits to be studied (6) should prove very serviceable.

The transmission of congenital *insanity* is obviously more difficult to trace than feeble-mindedness. Mott's (15) analysis of 18 families, in which both parents suffered from insanity, or nervous disease, or were suicides, shows that 39 per cent. of the offspring were affected; while in 90 families, where but one parent was afflicted, only 9.6 per cent. of the offspring were affected. His examination (16) of 508 pairs of parent and offspring shows a signal tendency to the occurrence of most of the insanity in the offspring of insane parents at a much earlier age than in the parent. This, he holds, is nature's way of ending a degenerate stock. He does not believe that the Mendelian proportions can be shown in the inheritance of the neuropathic tendency. Rosanoff (17) on the other hand, in a study of the inheritance of the neuropathic constitution,—using that term to designate a vast class of nervous and mental conditions,—found a close correspondence between the Mendelian formula and his actual results. Where the Mendelian expectation indicated 359 neuropathic offspring 351 were found, and where 578 normals were expected 586 were found. Manic-depressive insanity appears to be recessive to the normal condition, but dominant over epilepsy. Bateson (1) ascribes to dominant descent, along Mendelian lines, such nervous diseases as angioneurotic oedema, tremor hereditarius, Huntington's chorea, ptosis and probably several forms of spastic paralysis and myo-atrophy. He finds less abundant evidence of recessive conditions in man, but he thinks that paralysis agitans is one and, possibly, feeble-mindedness another. He also notes that some traits are limited wholly, or partially, by sex; thus, color blindness and a form of nystagmus are more apt to follow the male line than the

female. Similarity in the form of insanity affecting parent and offspring is nearly twice as frequent as dissimilarity, according to Corson (3). In manic-depressive cases it was observed that a strictly maniacal, or melancholic, state in an ancestor was more frequently associated with a similar state in a descendant—mania with mania, and melancholia with melancholia.

The transmission of *minor defects* has been observed by numerous investigators from time to time. Lundborg's (13) work is interesting in its endeavor to apply Mendel's law to the inheritance of deafmutism, which he believes to be a recessive and monohybrid. Of course, as he admits, it is difficult to determine when a case is congenital, or acquired, and there is room for differences of opinion in selecting cases for tabulation.

The inheritance of *normal abilities* is a more elusive study than that of the transmission of defects. Its material is less sharply marked and more susceptible to misunderstanding. Nevertheless we find Hurst (10) bravely applying the Mendelian Law to the musical temperament and finding that it behaves as a recessive character! Children who hum and whistle tunes are apparently *recessives*, while those who, "when not silent drone monotonously or are merely noisy," are *dominants*. Thorndike (19) maintains that both intelligence and morality are transmissible. In proof of the inheritance of such mental ability as the school demands he cites a study of 168 families having each two children. Of these families 138 contain two children who are both forward, or both backward, while only 30 families have two children with one "retarded" and one "accelerated." MacDonald's (14) comparison of the standing of school children, whose parents are in the laboring or non-laboring classes, native Americans, foreign-born or colored, seems to show striking differences. For example, the standing of the children of the laboring class is rather lower than that of the non-laboring people (teachers, officials, and tradespeople). Obviously, other factors than heredity enter into these comparisons. Josefovici (11) has gathered some interesting material illustrating the transmission of impulses, instincts and sensory traits. He calls attention, for example, to the families living in Paris for several generations, who originally came from the north, or the south, of France and who retain their indifference, or their susceptibility, to the cold of the city.

When the normal traits are sufficiently conspicuous and unusual the tracing of their transmission is more confident. Woods (22)

proves that the forty-six celebrities in the Hall of Fame are related to other exceptional people in many more instances than is the average person related to eminent persons. He declares "they are from five hundred to a thousand times as much related to distinguished people as the ordinary mortal is." His work upon the Influence of Monarchs (23) restates his earlier contention for heredity in royalty and points out a correlation between the high character and ability of reigning sovereigns and the prosperity of their age.

The problems of heredity as they affect the *race and society* have given rise to a literature, which is both scientific and popular. Periodicals are published in Germany, England and the United States dealing with the questions of inheritance from all imaginable, and some unimaginable, angles. The conviction is certainly growing which Burt (2) expresses: "So far as our meagre evidence goes the same principles that govern physical inheritance appear to govern mental inheritance too, . . . mental inheritance, then not only moulds the character of individuals, it rules the destiny of nations." That such a destiny is, in part, in the hands of men Whetham (21) maintains from evidence gathered from biology, sociology and psychology. How man can coöperate with nature in improving the race is the great problem. There is no unanimity, as yet, concerning who the unfit are and how they shall be artificially eliminated. As Mott (16) asserts, the same family stock sends out branches bearing both genius and insanity. Shelton (18) thinks it is both wrong and foolish to place any prohibition, or restriction, upon the propagation of an imagined defective class, in the present state of our information: for "great geniuses have at times been mad." A number of men have done great work with ill health and even disease; among them such as Nietzsche, Cowper, Keats, Brontes, Chatterton and John Davidson. Here is "the kind of failure and degeneracy the world needs." Walter (20) in the concluding chapters of his book, *Genetics*, also urges the necessity of caution.

These cautions are timely, in view of the hasty and inadequate legislation (7) which the eugenic propaganda inspire. There can be no question, however, that practical and effective measures for the isolation, or sterilization, of the congenitally defective will be adopted in the future. Society will not leave the matter to the defective, trusting, as Laverne (12) asserts, that the neuropathic strain finds marriage uncongenial. At present, the real problems are in the hands of the scientist, not the statesman.

REFERENCES

1. BATESON, W. An Address on Heredity. *Lancet*, 1913, Aug. 16, 451-454.
2. BURT, C. The Inheritance of Mental Characters. *Eugenics Rev.*, 1912, 4, 168-200.
3. CORSON, J. F. An Inquiry into the Occurrence of an Inherited Tendency to Insanity. *J. of Ment. Sci.*, 1912, 58, 262-298.
4. DANIELSON, F. H., & DAVENPORT, C. B. *The Hill Folk*. Memoir No. 1, Eugenics Record Office Publ., 1912. Pp. 56.
5. DAVENPORT, C. B. *The Family History Book*. Bull. 7, Eugenics Record Office Publ., 1912. Pp. 101.
6. DAVENPORT, C. B. *The Trait Book*. Bull. 6, Eugenics Record Office Publ., 1912. Pp. 52.
7. DAVENPORT, C. B. *State Laws Limiting Marriage Selection*. Bull. 9, Eugenics Record Office Publ., 1913. Pp. 74.
8. ESTERBROOK, A. H., & DAVENPORT, C. B. *The Nam Family*. Memoir No. 2, Eugenics Record Office Publ., 1912. Pp. 85.
9. GODDARD, H. H. *The Kallikak Family*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1912. Pp. xv + 117.
10. HURST, C. C. Mendelian Heredity in Man. *Eugenics Rev.*, 1912, 4, 1-25.
11. JOSEFOVICI, V. Die psychische Vererbung. *Arch. f. d. ges. Psychol.*, 1912, 23, 1-155.
12. LAVERGNE, —. Marriage et Psychopathes. *Arch. d'anthrop. criminelle*, 1912, 27, 616-629.
13. LUNDBORG, H. Ueber die Erblichkeitsverhältnisse der Konstitutionellen Taubstummheit. *Arch. f. Rassen. u. Gesell.—Biol.*, 1912, 9, 133-149.
14. MACDONALD, A. Eine Schulstatistik über Geistige Begabung. *Zsch. f. päd. Psychol.*, 1913, 14, 440-443.
15. MOTT, F. W. *Address on Heredity in Relation to Insanity*. London: Bartholomew Press, 1912. Pp. 3.
16. MOTT, F. W. The Neuropathic Inheritance. *J. of Mental Science*, 1913, 59, 222-253.
17. ROSANOFF, A. J. The Inheritance of the Neuropathic Constitution. *J. of Amer. Med. Assoc.*, 1912, 58, 1266-1269.
18. SHELTON, H. S. Eugenics. *Contemp. Rev.*, 1912, 101, 84-94.
19. THORNDIKE, E. L. Eugenics, with special Reference to Intellect and Character. *Pop. Sci. Mo.*, 1913, 83, 125-138.
20. WALTER, H. E. *Genetics: An Introduction to the Study of Heredity*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1913. Pp. xiv + 272.
21. WHETHAM, W. C. D. and WHETHAM, C. D. *Heredity and Society*. London: Longmans Green & Co., 1912. Pp. 195.
22. WOODS, F. A. Heredity and the Hall of Fame. *Pop. Sci. Mo.*, 1913, 82, 445-552.
23. WOODS, F. A. *The Influence of Monarchs*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1913. Pp. xiii + 422.

RACIAL DIFFERENCES

BY FRANK G. BRUNER

Chicago, Ill.

The perplexing questions arising out of the Negro problem in the South have given rise to some interesting, though not always convincing, discussions of the psychological differences between negroes and whites. Discussions which are not fairly anchored in experimental data are apt to be of little value and indeed often rest on erroneous presuppositions. Of such character is a paper by Bardin (2), who, ignoring such authorities as Boas, Haddon, Rivers and others, begins with the postulate that the negro and white races differ in physiological and mental organization to the same extent as they do in certain obvious anatomical features. He thence argues that differences in culture are fundamental and ineradicable. Of somewhat similar character is the paper by Jordan (3), who however professes to speak from personal acquaintance with the negro population in various parts of the South. His experience is that the more nearly white are the mixed bloods, as judged from skin color, the more do they approach the whites in mental and social alertness.

Experimental tests were made by Baldwin (1) on 37 white and 30 colored delinquent girls, ranging in age from 13 to 21 years, inmates of a Pennsylvania reformatory. Learning capacity was tested by a substitution test, with the average result that the negro girls did only 62.4 per cent. as much work as the whites in a given time, and made 245.3 per cent. more errors. The negro girls were "much slower to warm up to the occasion," and the first to drop back and lose interest. They were difficult to arouse and could not be forced or stimulated except, temporarily, through flattery. Their work was more irregular than that of the white girls, and dependent apparently on moods. While working at the tests they seemed only partially occupied with the task in hand, for at the same time they were making random movements, mumbling, grumbling, humming, and saying original and funny things. The fact that the tests failed to enlist the interest of the negroes to the same degree as the whites makes it difficult to judge of the real capacity for learning of the two groups.

The Binet-Simon tests were applied by Miss Strong (6) to 120 negro and 250 white children in the schools of Columbia, S. C. Unfortunately for our purpose, racial differences were purely an incidental consideration with the author and are not worked out adequately; but the following results are suggestive: 60.8 per cent. of the colored, as compared with 25.2 per cent. of the white children, rated below age in mental development; at age there were 30 per cent. of negro and 42.9 per cent. of white children; and above age 9.2 per cent. of negro and 26 per cent. of white children. The tables show another interesting point on which the author makes no comment. At the ages of six, seven and eight just about twice as many negro children as white rate below age, whereas for the ages of ten, eleven and twelve the superiority of the whites over the negroes is but slight. This suggests that the rate of maturing may be more rapid with the negro children, so as to make them older, mentally, at the age of twelve than white children of the same age.

Mayo (4) contributes a valuable study of the learning capacity of whites and negroes living under similar social and economic conditions and subjected to identical tuition and media of instruction, by comparing the school marks received by negro and white pupils of the New York City High Schools. The 150 negroes available for study were compared with an equal number of white pupils, selected at random from the same classes attended by the negroes. The median mark of the white pupils in all subjects taken together was 66; of the colored pupils, 62; and 29 per cent. of the colored reach the median mark for the whites. The average deviation is 7 for the white pupils and 6.5 for the colored. The per cent. of colored pupils reaching the median mark for whites in each group of school subjects is as follows: in modern languages, 33; in mathematics, 32; in history, 31; in science, 29; in Greek and Latin, 27; in English, 24; in the commercial branches, 22. These results tend to dispel the common conception of the negro as relatively good in English and especially inferior in subjects requiring abstract thought, such as science and mathematics. The poor showing of the negroes in English cannot be explained by home environment, since the white pupils who are here compared with the negroes come, many of them, from the homes of recent immigrants, in which little English is spoken. On the whole, the negroes seem to be distinctly below the whites, though the overlap is sufficient to make it easily possible to teach the two races in the same classes.

The common opinion that primitive peoples have existed in all stages of mental development, reaching down to a condition slightly above that of the ape, is challenged by Spiller (5), who cites authorities to show that even the native Australians display a surprising degree of intellectual power. From the testimony of missionaries and teachers who have lived among primitive peoples, he reaches the unwarranted conclusion that all the peoples of the earth are virtually equal to Europeans in mental and moral capacity. As a matter of fact, personal experience with a primitive people in their customary surroundings affords a very unsafe basis for estimating their mentality. A test of the power of meeting unfamiliar situations is necessary.

A very suggestive scheme for the study of any social group is offered by Thomas (7), who reports that he has applied it to the study of the Negro and of some European peasants. He assumes that the main factor responsible for the differences in mental and social attainment found among different peoples is expressible in terms of interest, stimulation, imitation, opportunity, occupational differentiation due to traditional or geographical limitations, and mental attitude in general. With Boas and others he believes that the general organization of mind is much the same in all races of mankind, and that the relative intelligence and advancement of a social group are dependent on the objects to which they give attention.

REFERENCES

1. BALDWIN, B. T. The Learning of Delinquent Adolescent Girls as Shown by a Substitution Test. *J. of Educ. Psychol.*, 1913, 4, 317-33.
2. BARDIN, J. The Psychological Factor in the Southern Race Problem. *Pop. Sci. Mo.*, 1913, 83, 368-374.
3. JORDAN, H. E. The Biological Status and Social Worth of the Mulatto. *Pop. Sci. Mo.*, 1912, 82, 573-582.
4. MAYO, M. J. The Mental Capacity of the American Negro. *Archives of Psychol.*, 1913, No. 28. Pp. 70. Also Columbia Contrib. to Philos. and Psychol., Vol. XXII, No. 2.
5. SPILLER, G. The Mentality of the Australian Aborigines. *Sociol. Rev.*, Oct., 1913, 1-6.
6. STRONG, A. M. Three Hundred Fifty White and Colored Children Measured by the Binet-Simon Measuring Scale of Intelligence. *Ped. Sem.*, 1913, 20, 485-512.
7. THOMAS, W. I. Race Psychology, Standpoint and Questionnaire. *Amer. J. of Sociol.*, 1912, 17, 725-775.

SPECIAL REVIEWS

Elemente der Völkerpsychologie: Grundlinien einer psychologischen Entwicklung der Menschheit. WILHELM WUNDT. Leipzig: Kröner, 1912. Pp. xii + 523.

In the early years of his psychological activities, Wundt crossed swords with Steinthal and Lazarus over the conception of a folk-soul. Now, almost fifty years later, he has to defend his own conception of *Völkerpsychologie* against the assaults of Delbrück and Hermann Paul. He believes in a folk-soul, but in one devoid of all metaphysical attributes. As the actions and interactions of psychic processes in the individual mind constitute the content of the individual soul, in so far as it is of interest to psychology, so the psychic processes and products which are due to the interplay of many minds constitute the content of a social soul (see *Völkerpsychologie*, Vol. I, pp. 9-15). Wundt is opposed to the theory that socio-psychological changes start with an accidental variation in an individual mind which is reproduced by imitation and thus becomes part of the culture of the group. Both the origin and the fixation of such psychic changes, according to him, are socially conditioned. Here, perhaps, lies the weakness of his theory.

Folk psychology is in no sense to be regarded as an applied psychology. Its studies should rather furnish new material to be utilized by psychology. The main subdivisions of the field are given by Language, Art, Religion, Myth, and Custom. In the five volumes of his *Völkerpsychologie*, Wundt segregated these subdivisions, following, as it were, a longitudinal sectioning of the cultural process; in his *Elemente*, he attempts a series of cross-sections, his analysis being directed to cultural eras. Of such eras he distinguishes three: the Era of Primitive Man, the Totemic Era, and the Era of Heroes and Gods—besides the incipient Era of Humanity.

As true representatives of primitive man Wundt accepts the pygmies discovered by Scheinfurt among the African Monbutta, the negritos, and a few other existing groups. Primitive man lives in his shanty, hut or cave, with him the dog, which through community of interests in protection from enemies and success in the chase, becomes his constant companion. He hunts when prompted by the pangs of hunger, but there is as yet no organized chase. It is

woman, the plant gatherer, who first learns to save and provide for the future. The digging stick, with a point charred in the fire, is the only working utensil. The weapons are the bow and arrow (later the boomerang). Primitive man knows the use of poisons, and thus makes his wooden-pointed arrow a deadly weapon. Fire he produces by rubbing together two sticks, or by boring in wood. The exclusive use of the bow and arrow, weapons that cannot be effectively used in combat, indicates that primitive man, on the whole, lived in peace with his neighbors. His art is based on memory, the recollections of his daily impressions, which give rise to naturalistic drawings on the walls of his cave. Barter is carried on secretly, the parties preferring not to meet one another face to face. Marriage is monogamous, and the families are herded together in small local communities. Practically no remnants of a truly primitive language are left, but an analysis of some relatively primitive Sudanese dialects reveals a remarkable resemblance, in form of expression and order of words, to the natural language of the deaf. The thought of primitive man is characterized by concrete concepts with but slight indications of abstraction. Magical beliefs pervade his mental life. The phenomena of death and disease are far more important factors in his religious life than are the heavenly bodies and their movements. He is not inquisitive; only the strange and unusual evokes his emotional and intellectual reaction. His dominant art is dancing, his only musical instruments two wooden sticks rhythmically beaten together, the drum, the rattle. Decorative art consists of simple geometrical designs. While the intellectual horizon of the savage is limited, his mental powers, in their own sphere of activity, seem not markedly inferior to those of civilized man. In his natural state, primitive man is open and honest, does not lie or steal. There being no incentives to transgression in these directions, his ethical status may be characterized as one of "negative morality" (pp. 12-115).

The Totemic Era is the epoch of tribal and kinship organization. Chiefs arise, and the primitive peace yields to a state of continuous warfare of tribe with tribe. Exogamy, which belongs to this Era, takes the form of a dual exogamous division of the tribe, primarily occasioned by the natural increase of population. The dual division is followed by further bifurcations resulting in four and eight classes. Horror of incest is not a cause but a consequence of exogamy. Both polyandry and polygyny occur, the former preceding and laying the foundation for the latter, while

group marriage results from a combination of the two. Monogamy is, however, the foundation of all these later forms of marriage. This Era is characterized by a close association of man and animal, the latter belonging to a realm somewhat superior to man, and often appearing as an ancestor. The totem animal, at the close of a long evolutionary career, becomes the domesticated animal of later periods. Totemic taboo is the earliest form of taboo. Totemism in its further transformations leads to manism (ancestor worship) and fetichism. Totemic cults are based on direct emotional reactions, and must be rather regarded as an important source than as an expression of totemic beliefs. The characteristic arts of the period are tattooing and the decoration of pottery, the designs being based predominantly upon the totemic animal. The typical myth of this Era is the half human, half animal story which is believed to be true (pp. 116-278).

The Era of Heroes and Gods is characterized from its very inception by vast migrations and mixtures of peoples. It is the age of domestication. To it belong the horse, the ox, the cow, the wheel, the wagon and the plow. Work becomes individualized, and division of labor is prominent. Private property develops. War consists of combats of individual champions accompanied by indefinite fights of the masses. The weapon of this period is the sword. The state consolidates, colonization begins. While in the Totemic Era the subdivisions of the tribe followed the dual principle, now the state is divided according to the number twelve, and later according to the number ten and its multiples. The characteristic family is the extended monogamous family, embracing three generations with a patriarch at its head. Social classes spring from conquests of one people by another; when the two cultures are very different, castes arise, when the contrast is less marked, social classes, differentiated in terms of property and power. The city and the state arise and grow together. Accumulated customary rules become consolidated into a fixed body of laws. God is the product of this era. Pure monotheism, however, must be regarded as a product of philosophical speculation, all natural religions recognizing many gods besides the one god. The cardinal distinction of a god from a demon or spirit consists in the definite personality of the former when compared with the vague and fleeting characteristics of the latter. The typical myth of this period is the hero-myth, which bears clear traces of its multiple derivation from the stories and myths of the preceding era. Art

is now characterized by the domination of grand concepts as embodied in architecture, together with the elaboration of detail in the realms of sculpture and painting. The drama arises as a highly complex product of literary and mythological sources belonging to the preceding period (pp. 279-464).

The incipient Era of Humanity is treated by Wundt in very general terms. May it suffice here to indicate the main subdivisions of the section: (1) *Der Begriff der Humanität*; (2) *Die Weltreiche*; (3) *Die Weltkultur*; (4) *Die Weltgeschichte*.

Wundt's conception of the three Eras is in no sense a contribution to the interpretation of history. It will be noted that their dominant characteristics are selected from different domains of culture: the first being on the whole characterized by its material achievements, the second by its social system, the third by its religion. The selection is obviously arbitrary and one-sided. Wundt himself seems to regard the eras rather as a frame for loosely embracing the mass of material than as a substantial contribution; and we should perhaps do better justice to his effort by disregarding them altogether.

Wundt's treatment of the culture of primitive man is, on the whole, admirable. We must endorse his insistence on original monogamy and his rejection of the hypothesis of promiscuity. His interpretation of group marriage is ingenious and, while speculative, certainly suggestive. The designation of the earliest period of human culture as the Age of Wood deserves serious consideration. His treatment of totemism, on the other hand, contains serious errors of fact and judgment. The formation of clans by successive bifurcations of a tribe is a process that cannot be substantiated by facts, and the entire "*Princip der Zweiteilung*" is distinctly "*aus der Luft gegriffen*." The alleged striking resemblance of the social systems of Australia and the Iroquois is largely imaginary; and the three forms of exogamy ascribed to the Australian system (pp. 145-147) are based on some amazing misconception. The assertion that the belief in animal ancestors *must* have preceded that in human ancestors (p. 229) is not supported by ethnological evidence and opinion. The characteristics of a mythical story, distinctive of Wundt's Totemic Era, may be identified one by one among the Eskimo whose culture could by no amount of ingenuity be squeezed into a totemic frame.

But Wundt's work is replete with fact and theory, and a full analysis would carry us far beyond the limits of this review. His

great contribution, moreover, does not lie in the masterly condensed exposition of a vast body of material, nor in the conceptual scheme which determined the formal structure of the work. Wundt's *Elemente* may be regarded as the first theoretical work of large scope in which the results of modern ethnological research have been systematically utilized. Thus, we find a deeply rooted appreciation of the importance of diffusion of culture and the mixture of peoples (p. 48), and a constant insistence on the multiplicity of psychic sources of cultural phenomena, and on the principle of the psychic transformation of cultural values. He dwells repeatedly on the circumstance that the ultimate sources of social change must be elemental and unconscious, as exemplified by the transition from the primitive to the totemic social organization (p. 151), by the formulation of law (pp. 325, 346), and by the semi-accidental character of inventions (pp. 24, 291). One of the leading thoughts of the entire book is the importance of emotion as a source of cultural phenomena. Wundt, perhaps the first among the historians of culture, has set an example for psychologists and anthropologists by drawing psychological and epistemological conclusions from an analysis of primitive languages (pp. 11-13, 15). Particularly significant, finally, in view of Wundt's prominence as an evolutionist, is his realization of the tremendous complexity of the historical process and the unique character of each historical happening (p. 346).

Thus, whatever may be said in criticism, the *Elemente der Völkerpsychologie* remains a contribution of consummate knowledge and wisdom, and its analysis of cultural processes stands, in its main conclusions, in close agreement with the findings of the modern Science of Man.

A. A. GOLDENWEISER

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

The North American Indian of the Plains. CLARK WISSLER.
Popular Science Monthly, 1913, 83, 436-444.

In this paper Dr. Wissler briefly characterizes the trend of recent anthropological thinking, illustrating his points by the concrete example of the Plains culture area. Anthropology, as the science of culture, has become sharply separated from biology, and has been obliged to turn from theories of evolution generalizing the course of development to interpretations based on historical analysis. After sketching the main features of Plains culture, the

author turns to the problem, whether the great degree of uniformity throughout the area is due to independent invention or to historical contact. His conclusion is that Plains culture "was the joint product of many tribes, some working out one trait, others again different traits, which by tribal contact and interaction were gradually diffused over the area. In other words, the culture as a complex was worked out by the Plains Indians themselves, but probably not by any one group and probably not without very material aid from tribes in other culture areas."

ROBERT H. LOWIE

AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY

Kinship and Social Organisation. W. H. R. RIVERS. London: Constable, 1914. Pp. vii + 96.

This essay deals with one of the most abstruse and technical of ethnological subjects,—terms of relationship. Nevertheless, it is of considerable interest to psychologists, for the point discussed by Dr. Rivers is whether the relationship terminology employed by various peoples can be explained on psychological grounds. This had been the contention of Kroeber, who emphatically rejects a sociological interpretation of kinship terms, which he views as purely psychologico-linguistic products. Against this position Rivers advances the thesis that "not only has the general character of systems of relationship been strictly determined by social conditions, but every detail of these systems has also been so determined" (p. 93f.). This view he is able to demonstrate in several instances, but his generalization is certainly too broad.

ROBERT H. LOWIE

The Belief in Immortality; and the Worship of the Dead. Vol. I: *The Belief among the Aborigines of Australia, the Torres Straits Islands, New Guinea and Melanesia.* J. G. FRAZER. New York: Macmillan, 1913. Pp. xxi + 495.

In the present work Dr. Frazer avowedly confines himself to "a collection of facts illustrative of the belief in immortality and of all the momentous consequences which have flowed from that belief." He does not, needless to say, wholly eschew comparison, but the method here followed of abstracting, at considerable length, the testimony of authorities for each of the areas considered tends to preclude too frequent clashing with the rigorously historical methods of recent years. In regard to historical method, he is

decidedly conservative; but as regards psychological interpretation he is nothing less than Bourbon. He insists on the "rational basis of savage life"; he rejects absolutely the doctrine that savages act first and afterwards invent reasons for their conduct; and he cannot imagine how "any race of men who invariably acted first and thought afterwards" could survive in the struggle for existence; finally, he is convinced that the believers in the essential irrationality of savage conduct uniformly lack personal experience with primitive cultures (pp. 264-266). It is difficult to remain patient at this tissue of misconceptions. Dr. Frazer confuses two problems that are distinct. We may readily admit that primitive mentality does not differ essentially from ours, and that accordingly primitive men, like ourselves, are not incapable of logical reasoning. But it is a far cry from the psychological unity of mankind to the dogma of a rational basis for savage life. The alternative that we, too, may act first and reason about our actions afterward, seems not to have occurred to the author. The secondary character of what purports to be the basis of savage conduct has been repeatedly demonstrated—perhaps most clearly with regard to ceremonial behavior. Again and again, the same series of ceremonial activities, occurring in neighboring tribes, and in some instances borrowed from a single source, is found coupled with *different* theoretical interpretations of these activities. Of these only one can conceivably be the basis of the conduct, the others *must* be secondary; and there is no reason for assigning an exceptional significance to the one theory that is not, by logical necessity, proved secondary; more probably it too, like its compeers, serves to explain a pre-existing practice. The "rational basis" thus turns out to be a rationalistic afterthought.

The purely descriptive task which Dr. Frazer has set himself is well executed. He has collected all the available information with exemplary industry, utilizing not only the standard works, but a host of recondite articles buried in periodicals and communications of missionary societies; and his beautiful English continues to arouse admiration and envy.

ROBERT H. LOWIE

The "Psychological Interpretation of Language." A. M. HOCART.
Brit. J. of Psychol., 5, 267-279.

This distinctly clever paper will interest the ethnologist mainly for its concrete illustrations of principles rather generally recognized in his circles. In a psychological journal, however, the principles

themselves require formulation, for if misconceptions prevail to a lamentable extent among educated laymen on any subject of primitive life and mentality, it is assuredly that of primitive language. Basing his discussion entirely on the Fijian field with which he has familiarized himself, Mr. Hocart points out that the supposed richness of concrete terminology and concomitant absence of abstract words is not amenable to a simple psychological interpretation, such as the inferior ability of the savage to see identity in difference. The development of a language is due to no rationalistic, logic-chopping analysis of the universe, but is conditioned by practical considerations in the life of the people using it. This can be illustrated no less clearly by the English than by the Fijian tongue. A Fijian is specific along lines that interest him, such as planting, handicrafts, war, while he is exasperatingly abstract in fields where English is more precise. Language must be correlated with the culture in the midst of which it developed or of which it forms a part. And, moreover, as our own language becomes intelligible only as an *historical* product, so in the speech of savage tribes the importance of historical conditions must be constantly kept in mind.

ROBERT H. LOWIE

BOOKS RECEIVED

- MÜNSTERBERG, H. *Psychology: General and Applied*. New York: Appleton, 1914. Pp. xiv + 487. \$1.75.
- BURR, C. B. *A Handbook of Psychology and Mental Disease*. Philadelphia: F. A. Davis Co., 1914. Pp. viii + 235. \$1.50.
- COHEN-KYSER, A. *Die mechanistischen Grundgesetze des Lebens*. Leipzig: Barth, 1914. Pp. viii + 373. Mk. 7.
- SEASHORE, C. E. *Psychology in Daily Life*. New York: Appleton, 1914. Pp. xviii + 226. \$1.50.
- Eugenics: Twelve University Lectures*. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1914. Pp. xiii + 348. \$2.
- DAVIS, T. K. *Mind and Spirit*. Boston: Sherman, French & Co., 1914. Pp. 115. \$1.
- REGIS, E. & HESNARD, A. *La psychoanalyse des névroses et des psychoses*. Paris: Alcan, 1914. Pp. xii + 384. 3 fr. 50.
- BREITWEISER, J. V. *Psychological Experiments*. Colorado Springs, Colo.: Apex Book Co., 1914. Pp. 187.
- WOODS, F. A. *The Influence of Monarchs*. New York: Macmillan, 1913. Pp. xiii + 422.
- TÜRCK, H. *The Man of Genius*. London: A. & C. Black, and New York: Macmillan, 1914. Pp. 483. \$4.
- OGDEN, R. M. *An Introduction to General Psychology*. New York: Longmans, Green, 1914. Pp. xviii + 270. \$1.25.
- YERKES, R. M. & LARUE, D. W. *Outline of a Study of the Self*. (Rev. ed.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1914. Pp. 24.
- WATSON, J. B. *Behavior. An Introduction to Comparative Psychology*. New York: Holt, 1914. Pp. xii + 439.
- NEARING, S. *The Super Race. An American Problem*. New York: Huebsch, 1912. Pp. 89. \$0.50.
- BERGSON, H. *Dreams. An Explanation of the Mechanism of Dreaming*. (Trans. by E. E. Slosson.) New York: Huebsch, 1914. Pp. 57. \$0.60.
- BARNES, E. *The Psychology of Childhood and Youth*. New York: Huebsch, 1914. Pp. 68. \$0.50.

- BRUCE, H. A. *Adventurings in the Psychical*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1914. Pp. vi + 318. \$1.35.
- CARUS, P. *Truth and Other Poems*. Chicago: Open Court Pub. Co., 1914. Pp. 61. \$1.
- RUSSELL, B. *Scientific Method in Philosophy*. Chicago: Open Court Pub. Co., 1914. Pp. vii + 245. \$2.
- ENRIQUES, F. *Problems of Science*. (Trans. by K. Royce; introd. note by J. Royce.) Chicago: Open Court Pub. Co., 1914. Pp. xvi + 392. \$2.50.

NOTES AND NEWS

THE present number of the BULLETIN, dealing with race and individual psychology, has been prepared under the editorial direction of Professor R. S. Woodworth, of Columbia University.

DR. KARL HEILBRONNER, professor of psychiatry in the University of Utrecht, known to psychologists especially for his contributions on aphasia, died on September 8.

DR. WALTER S. HUNTER, of the University of Texas, has been promoted to the grade of adjunct professor.

J. CROSBY CHAPMAN, B.A. (Cambridge), D.Sc. (London), Ph.D. (Columbia), has been appointed assistant professor of experimental education in Western Reserve University.

DR. A. H. SUTHERLAND, of the University of Illinois, has been appointed instructor in psychology in Yale University.

DR. CLARA HARRISON TOWN has announced the opening of an office in Chicago, where she is prepared to examine and treat mentally atypical persons.

